REMARKS

Claims 1-55 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 28, and 55 being independent. Reconsideration and allowance of Applicant's claims are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-34, 36-44, and 46-55 under 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,393,464 (Dieterman). The Office Action further rejected dependant claims 8, 18, 35 and 45 under 103(a) in view of Dieterman and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0009385 (Tucciarrone). Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn because Dieterman does not describe or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 28, and 55 and Tucciarrone fails to cure the deficiencies of Dieterman.

For instance, Dieterman does not describe or suggest adding a sender to a list when the sender is determined to be known to the user based, at least in part, on the interactions between the user and a received message, as recited in independent claim 1. Dieterman describes a parental control system where emails to and from a child's account are selectively delivered based on "an allowed list." *See, e.g., Abstract.* Typically, the allowed list is created by the parent/account administrator manually adding email addresses to the allowed list. *See Dieterman, col. 3, line 49 – col. 4, line 5, FIG. 2.* Specifically, :

> The allowed list is typically created by an account administrator and contains the identifications of entities with which the user is permitted to communicate freely. FIG. 2 depicts a sample email terminal screen display 15 on which the administrator may view the content of the allowed list and add, delete and edit the identities of entities appearing on the allowed list. ... Screen display 15 illustrates the user interface for adding, deleting and editing email addresses. In the example illustrated, the list 16 of allowed addresses comprises123 names as indicated by counter 19. The adding or editing of email addresses is performed via dialog box

17. The allowed list may be selectively enabled or disabled by software switch
18.

Dieterman, col. 3, line 49 – col. 4, line 5. Dieterman also describes providing the

parent/administrator with an option to add an e-mail address to the allowed list after the

administrator approves a message from the sender. See Col. 6, lines 5-10.

However, in both of these scenarios, the e-mail addresses are added to the list by the

parent, irrespective of any interactions between the child and a received message. In particular,

Dieterman "prevents communications between a user and entities who do not appear on an

'allowed list.'" *Dieterman, col. 3, lines 48-49 (emphasis added)*. Therefore, any message to the

child from a sender, who is not already on the allowed list, will not be delivered to the child. As

a result, there is no opportunity for interaction between the child and a message before the e-mail

address is added to the list, because the child will not receive the message until the address is

added to the list. Consequently, the e-mail address is not added to the list based on interaction

between the child and a received message. Dieterman, therefore, does not describe or suggest

adding a person to the list when the person is determined to be known to the user based at least in

part on the interactions between the user and the received message directed to the user, as recited

in claim 1. Tuccianrone fails to cure these deficiencies of Dieterman.

Accordingly, Dieterman, and Tuccianrone, either alone or in combination, fail to describe

or suggest all of the features of independent claim 1. Similarly, independent claim 28 recites

"adding the sender to the list when the sender is determined to be known to the user based, at

least in part, on the interactions between the user and the received message." Claim 55 recites

"means for adding the sender to the list when the sender is determined to be known to the user

based, at least in part, on interactions between the user and a received message directed to the user." Applicant submits that Dieterman and Tuccianrone do not describe or suggest these features of claims 28 and 55 at least for the reason described with respect to claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 28, 55 and those claims that depend from them, are allowable over Dieterman for at least the reasons given above.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, objection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the rejected claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/21/07

Kevin E. Greene
Reg. No. 46,031

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40466197.doc